

## United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SHERMAN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

ARTHUR JAMES PIERRE (32)

§

§

§

§

§

Case Number: 4:10-CR-36

Judge Mazzant

### **MEMORANDUM OPINION & ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Defendant Arthur James Pierre’s Motion for Compassionate Release and sentence reduction (Dkt. #1214). The Court, having considered the Motion, the response, the record, and the applicable law, finds that the motion must be **DENIED**.

#### **I. BACKGROUND**

On July 15, 2013, Defendant Arthur James Pierre (“Pierre”) was convicted of Conspiracy to Distribute or Possess with Intent to Distribute Cocaine; Methamphetamine; Marijuana; Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (Ecstasy) in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846 (Dkt. #763). Pierre was sentenced to 264 months’ imprisonment (Dkt. # 1053). He is serving his sentence at FCI Oakdale I. See <https://www.bop.gov/inmateloc/>. The Bureau of Prisons projects he will be released by April 29, 2032. *Id.*

Pierre filed his motion for compassionate release, *pro se*, on November 17, 2020 (Dkt. #1214). Pierre argued that because of his health condition, including suffering from chronic kidney disease, hypertensive heart disease, and chronic viral Hepatitis C, he had a heightened risk of death if he contracted COVID-19. Pierre sought compassionate release based on his underlying medical conditions and COVID-19, arguing these present “extraordinary and compelling reasons” to grant a sentence reduction (Dkt. # 1214). In the alternative, he asked the Court to place him in home confinement (Dkt. #1214). The Government opposed the sentence reduction, arguing:

(1) Pierre had not demonstrated “extraordinary and compelling reasons” supporting a sentence reduction; and (2) a sentence reduction was unwarranted under the Section 3553(a) factors (Dkt. # 1218). On March 9, 2021, the Court denied Pierre’s motion (Dkt. #1226).

On March 22, 2021, Pierre filed his notice of appeal to the Fifth Circuit appealing the Court’s denial of his motion (Dkt. #1227). Shortly after, on April 7, 2021, the Fifth Circuit published its opinion in *United States v. Shkambi*, 993 F.3d 388 (5th Cir. 2021), which clarified the standard for motions for compassionate release such as Pierre’s. On June 3, 2021, the government filed a motion for limited remand with the Fifth Circuit, requesting that Pierre’s motion be remanded for a re-evaluation under the proper legal standards articulated by *Shkambi*. (Fifth Circuit, Case No. 21-40213, Doc. # 00515885620 (June 3, 2021)). On June 15, 2021, the Fifth Circuit granted the Government’s motion and remanded Pierre’s motion for compassionate release to this Court (Dkt. #1230).

On August 26, 2021, Pierre filed supplemental briefing in support of his motion, arguing he met the applicable legal standards from *Shkambi* (Dkt. #1232). The Government responded on September 10, 2021, asserting that “[t]he Court’s original analysis of the merits of Pierre’s motion was spot on” (Dkt. #1233 at p.1).

## **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

A judgment of conviction imposing a sentence of imprisonment “constitutes a final judgment and may not be modified by a district court except in limited circumstances.” *Dillon v. United States*, 560 U.S. 817, 824 (2010) (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3582(b)); *see also* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c). One such circumstance arises from 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), the statute authorizing compassionate release. Under § 3582(c)(1)(A), a district court may grant a sentence reduction if it finds: (1) a defendant “fully exhausted all administrative rights”; (2) “extraordinary and

compelling reasons warrant such a reduction”; (3) “such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission”; and (4) such a reduction is appropriate “after considering the factors set forth in § 3553(a) to the extent that they are applicable.” 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A).

The First Step Act of 2018 made the first major changes to compassionate release since its authorization in 1984. Pub. L. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194. Procedurally, the First Step Act removed the Director of the BOP as the sole arbiter of compassionate release. Instead, the law enabled a defendant to move for compassionate release directly in district court after exhausting their administrative rights. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). Prior to this change, the BOP retained sole gatekeeping authority over compassionate release petitions. *United States v. Brooker*, 976 F.3d 228, 232 (2d Cir. 2020). This resulted in underuse and mismanagement.<sup>1</sup> *Id.* Through the First Step Act, Congress sought to mitigate this by “increasing the use and transparency of compassionate release.” Pub. L. 115-391, 132 Stat. 5194, 5239 (capitalization omitted).

Substantively, the First Step Act also modified the “extraordinary and compelling reasons” determination. Congress never defined what constitutes “extraordinary and compelling,” but rather delegated this determination to the Sentencing Commission.<sup>2</sup> By the text of § 3582(c)(1)(A), any sentence reduction must be “consistent with applicable policy statements

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2013, a report from the Office of the Inspector General revealed that the BOP granted compassionate release to only an average of 24 incarcerated people per year. See U.S. Dep’t of Just. Office of the Inspector General, *The Federal Bureau of Prisons’ Compassionate Release Program* 1 (2013), <https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/oig-reports/e1306.pdf> (last visited April 14, 2020). And of the 208 people whose release requests were approved by both a warden and a BOP Regional Director, 13% died awaiting a final decision by the BOP Director. *Id.*; see also *Extraordinary and Compelling: A Re-Examination of the Justifications for Compassionate Release*, 68 MD. L. REV. 850, 868 (2009) (noting that, in the 1990s, 0.01 percent of inmates annually were granted compassionate release).

<sup>2</sup> In 28 U.S.C. § 994(a)(2), Congress granted the Commission broad authority to promulgate “general policy statements regarding application of the guidelines or any other aspect of sentencing or sentence implementation that in the view of the Commission would further the purposes set forth in [18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2)].” And in 28 U.S.C. § 994(t), “Congress instructed the Commission to ‘describe what should be considered extraordinary and compelling reasons for sentence reduction, including the criteria to be applied and a list of specific examples.’” *United States v. Garcia*, 655 F.3d 426, 435 (5th Cir. 2011) (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 994(t)).

issued by the Sentencing Commission.” However, since passage of the First Step Act, the Sentencing Commission has not updated its guidelines on compassionate release.<sup>3</sup> This has created significant disagreement across the country whether the pre-First Step Act policy statement is still “applicable,” and thus binding on district courts.

The Fifth Circuit recently joined the Second, Fourth, Sixth, Seventh, and Tenth Circuits in concluding that § 1B1.13 is no longer binding on a district court. *See Shkambi*, 993 F.3d at 393 (“The district court on remand is bound only by § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) and, as always, the sentencing factors in § 3553(a). In reaching this conclusion, we align with every circuit court to have addressed the issue.”). Under this new framework, § 1B1.13 still binds district courts on motions made by the BOP, but for motions made directly by an inmate, district courts are free to consider any relevant fact in determining if “extraordinary and compelling reasons” exist. *See Brooker*, 976 F.3d at 235–36 (because the First Step Act allows both inmates and the BOP to file compassionate-release motions under § 3582(c)(1)(A), § 1B1.13 now applies only when such motions are made by the BOP and is inapplicable when a compassionate-release motion is made by a defendant); *United States v. McCoy*, 981 F.3d 271, 282 (4th Cir. 2020) (“A sentence reduction brought about by motion of a defendant, rather than the BOP, is not a reduction ‘under this policy statement.’”); *United States v. Gunn*, 980 F.3d 1178, 1180 (7th Cir. 2020) (agreeing with *Brooker* and holding that there is no “applicable” policy statement for § 3582(c)(1)(A) motions after the First Step Act); *United States v. Jones*, 980 F.3d 1098, 1109 (6th Cir. 2020) (“Until the Sentencing Commission updates § 1B1.13 to reflect the First Step Act, district courts have full discretion in the interim to determine whether an ‘extraordinary and compelling’ reason justifies compassionate release”).

---

<sup>3</sup> The Sentencing Commission currently lacks a quorum to issue new guidelines.

Despite this newfound discretion, district courts are not without guidance in determining whether “extraordinary and compelling reasons” exist. First, Congress has explicitly limited that “[r]ehabilitation of the defendant *alone* shall not be considered an extraordinary and compelling reason.” 28 U.S.C. § 994(t) (emphasis added). Second, the Sentencing Commission’s policy statement and commentary is still persuasive. *United States v. Logan*, No. 97-CR-0099(3), 2021 WL 1221481 (D. Minn., Apr. 1, 2021) (finding that § 1B1.13’s definition of “extraordinary and compelling” should be afforded “substantial deference . . . as such deference is consistent with the intent (even if not mandated by the letter) of § 3582(c)(1)(A)”). Application Note 1 of the policy statement provides that “extraordinary and compelling reasons” exist when: (1) a terminal illness or other medical condition “substantially diminishes the ability of the defendant to provide self-care within the environment of a correctional facility”; (2) a defendant, who is at least 65 years old, “is experiencing a serious deterioration in physical or mental health because of the aging process” and “has served at least 10 years or 75 percent of his or her term of imprisonment”; and (3) a defendant has minor children without a caregiver or with an incapacitated spouse or partner who needs the defendant to be the caregiver . U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13, n.1(A)-(C). Lastly, BOP Program Statement 5050.50 (“PS 5050.50”), amended after passage of the First Step Act, describes the factors BOP considers grounds for compassionate release. *See* PS 5050.50 ¶¶ 3–6. These grounds are similar to the reasons identified by the Sentencing Commission, but also include a list of factors like rehabilitation and circumstances of the offense.<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

Building from this guidance, district courts across the country have identified additional situations where “extraordinary and compelling reasons” exist. First, while rehabilitation alone is

---

<sup>4</sup> PS 5050.50’s nonexclusive factors are: “the defendant’s criminal and personal history, nature of his offense, disciplinary infractions, length of sentence and amount of time served, current age and age at the time of offense and sentencing, release plans, and ‘[w]hether release would minimize the severity of the offense.’” *United States v. Saldana*, 807 F. App’x 816, 819 (10th Cir. 2020) (quoting PS 5050.50 ¶ 7).

not an “extraordinary and compelling” reason for a sentence reduction, it can be a significant factor warranting a sentence reduction when an inmate has an otherwise qualifying condition.<sup>5</sup> *See United States v. Rodriguez*, 451 F.Supp.3d 392, 405 (E.D. Pa. 2020) (noting that the Sentencing Commission itself interpreted § 3582(c)(1)(A) as allowing consideration of an inmate’s rehabilitation). If an inmate demonstrates a long, comprehensive record of rehabilitation, it goes to whether injustice would result if they remain incarcerated. *See Brooker*, 976 F.3d at 238 (identifying “the injustice of [a] lengthy sentence” as a factor that may weigh in favor of a sentence reduction). Second, courts consider any changes in law and the sentencing guidelines when determining if a sentence is extraordinary. For example, courts grant compassionate release at a remarkable rate for inmates subject to the now abolished § 924(c) sentence-stacking. *See McCoy*, 981 F.3d at 285 (“As the court observed in *Bryant*, multiple district courts have concluded that the severity of a § 924(c) sentence, combined with the enormous disparity between that sentence and the sentence a defendant would receive today, can constitute an ‘extraordinary and compelling’ reason for relief under § 3582(c)(1)(A)”). Though Congress did not retroactively eliminate § 924(c) sentence-stacking, courts consider whether the outdated policy warrants relief on a case-by-case basis.<sup>6</sup>

Even if extraordinary and compelling reasons exist, they must outweigh the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors to warrant sentence reduction. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). These factors are:

- (1) the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant;
- (2) the need for the sentence imposed—

---

<sup>5</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) aids the Court in determining whether a defendant is a danger to the community. Applicable factors include: “the nature and circumstances of the offense,” “the person’s character, physical and mental condition, family ties, employment, . . . criminal history,” and “the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by the person’s release.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g).

<sup>6</sup> *See* Shon Hopwood, *Second Looks & Second Chances*, 41 CARDOZO L. REV. 83, 123–24 (2019) (arguing Congress did not make § 924(c) sentence stacking retroactive because it did not want to make all inmates “*categorically*” eligible for sentencing relief, but Congress meant for relief from draconian sentences to apply “*individually*”).

- (A) to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense;
  - (B) to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct;
  - (C) to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant; and
  - (D) to provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, medical care, or other correctional treatment in the most effective manner;
- (3) the kinds of sentences available;
  - (4) the kinds of sentence and sentencing range [provided for in the U.S.S.G.] . . .
  - (5) any pertinent [Sentencing Commission] policy statement . . .
  - (6) the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct; and
  - (7) the need to provide restitution to any victims of the offense.

*Id.* § 3553(a).

### **III. DISCUSSION**

Pierre moves for compassionate release based on his chronic kidney disease, heart disease, hypertension, and Hepatitis C. Pierre argues these medical conditions, coupled with the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, warrant a sentence reduction. The Government argues Pierre's conditions are not severe enough to qualify for compassionate release.

After re-evaluating Pierre's motion under the proper legal standards articulated in *Shkambi*, the Court still finds that Pierre's motion must be denied. Although Pierre has met § 3582(c)(1)(A)'s exhaustion requirement, he has not met the statute's requirement that "extraordinary and compelling reasons" exist warranting a reduction of his sentence.

#### **A. Pierre Has Met Section 3582(c)(1)(A)'s Exhaustion Requirement.**

Pierre's compassionate release motion may only be considered if he first meets

§ 3582(c)(1)(A)’s exhaustion requirement. Courts may not consider a modification to a defendant’s sentence under § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) unless a motion for such a modification is properly made by the Director of the BOP or by a defendant who has fully exhausted their administrative remedies. 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A). Fully exhausting administrative remedies requires a denial by the warden of a defendant’s facility or waiting thirty days without receiving a response to a request, whichever is earlier.<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

Section 3582(c)(1)(A)’s exhaustion requirement is not waivable. *See United States v. Rivas*, 833 F. App’x 556, 558 (5th Cir. 2020) (“Because the statutory language is mandatory—that a prisoner must exhaust their BOP remedy before filing in district court—we must enforce this procedural rule . . .”); *United States v. Reeves*, No. 18-00294, 2020 WL 1816496, at \*2 (W.D. La. Apr. 9, 2020) (“While the Court is well aware of the effects the Covid-19 pandemic . . . § 3582(c)(1)(A) does not provide this Court with the equitable authority to excuse Reeves’ failure to exhaust his administrative remedies or to waive the 30-day waiting period.”). If a defendant has not sought relief from the BOP, or has not waited thirty days since seeking relief, the Court may not consider their motion.

On April 24, 2020, Pierre asked the warden at FCI Oakdale I to grant him compassionate release (Dkt. #1214 Exhibit A). On May 8, 2020, the warden denied Pierre’s request. (Dkt. #1214 Exhibit A). Pierre has, therefore, met § 3582(c)(1)(A)’s exhaustion requirement.

**B. Pierre Has Not Met Section 3582(c)(1)(A)’s Requirement that “Extraordinary and Compelling Reasons” Warrant a Sentence Reduction.**

Pierre’s compassionate release motion turns on his assertion that the risks to his health

---

<sup>7</sup> BOP regulations define “warden” to include “the chief executive officer of . . . any federal penal or correctional institution or facility.” 28 C.F.R. § 500.1(a); *United States v. Franco*, 973 F.3d 465, 468 (5th Cir. 2020); *c.f. United States v. Campagna*, 16 Cr. 78-01 (LGS), 2020 WL 1489829, at \*3 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 27, 2020) (holding that “the denial of Defendant’s request by the Residential Re-entry Manager suffices to exhaust his administrative rights”).



associated with COVID-19—coupled with his chronic kidney disease, heart disease, hypertension, and Hepatitis C—constitute extraordinary and compelling reasons to reduce his sentence. Pierre’s assertion fails because his conditions are not severe enough to constitute “extraordinary and compelling reasons” under § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i).

The Court has discretion to decide whether Pierre’s conditions present “extraordinary and compelling reasons” warranting a sentence reduction. *See Shkambi*, 993 F.3d at 392. The Court is not bound by the Sentencing Commission’s policy statement and may consider any relevant facts in evaluating Pierre’s condition of incarceration. *Id.* Typically, courts consider whether a defendant suffers from a serious health condition, has a record of rehabilitation, the nature and circumstances of defendant’s offense, and whether a sentence is based on outdated law. *See Brooker*, 976 F.3d at 238.

Rehabilitation alone cannot support a claim for sentence reduction but may be considered as a factor in evaluating “extraordinary and compelling reasons.” *Id.* at 237–38; *United States v. Hudec*, No. 4:91-1-1, 2020 WL 4925675, at \*5 (S.D. Tex. Aug. 20, 2020). Here, Pierre has not remained incident-free during his sentence (Dkt. #1218). Pierre received three disciplinary sanctions while in custody: one sanction for possession of gambling paraphernalia, one sanction for fighting, and another sanction for possession of a cellphone (Dkt. #1218 p. 12). Pierre played a lead role in the cocaine conspiracy he was charged under and has served less than 50% of his sentence (Dkt. #763).

When considering if a defendant’s health condition supports compassionate release, the mere existence of COVID-19 in society cannot independently justify a sentence reduction. *See United States v. Miller*, No. 2:17-CR-015-D, 2020 WL 2514887, \*2 (N.D. Tex. May 15, 2020) (citing *United States v. Raia*, 954 F.3d 594, 597 (3d Cir. 2020)). For a defendant to be granted

compassionate release based on COVID-19, defendant must have a serious comorbidity and evidence the facility is not effectively controlling the spread of the virus. *See United States v. Vasquez*, No. CR 2:18-1282-S-1, 2020 WL 3000709, at \*3 (S.D. Tex. June 2, 2020) (“General concerns about the spread of COVID-19 or the mere fear of contracting an illness in prison are insufficient grounds to establish the extraordinary and compelling reasons necessary to reduce a sentence.”).

In the instant case, Pierre fails to show any health conditions that warrant compassionate release. Pierre is not subject to a terminal illness. Pierre’s conditions do not substantially diminish his ability to provide self-care in prison. Pierre has does not have comorbidities of COVID-19 and his health appears stable. Further, chronic kidney disease, heart disease, hypertension, and Hepatitis C are insufficient to constitute “extraordinary and compelling reasons” alone unless combined with other extenuating circumstances. *See United States v. Manzano*, No. 16-cr-20593, 2020 WL 7223301, at \*3–4 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 8, 2020) (collecting cases and finding hypertension and diabetes were “extraordinary and compelling” when combined with defendant’s age and the lack of health protections implemented by her facility); *see also United States v. Guyton*, No. 11-271, 2020 WL 2128579, at \*3 (E.D. La. May 5, 2020) (denying compassionate release for a 45-year-old with mild hypertension). Pierre has not indicated that he has any physical restrictions, aside from those related to the successful management of his chronic kidney disease, heart disease, hypertension, and Hepatitis C by medical professionals. His age of 55 also does not support compassionate release.

Absent COVID-19, Pierre would present no basis for compassionate release because his medical ailments are appropriately managed and do not impede his ability to provide self-care in the institution. Further FCI Oakdale I reports one active case among inmates and twenty-seven

among staff. FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, *COVID-19 Cases*, <https://www.bop.gov/coronavirus/> (last visited Sep. 27, 2021). Additionally, on April 13, 2021, the BOP offered Pierre the Pfizer-BioNTech Covid-19 vaccine, but Pierre refused the shot (Dkt. #1233, Exhibit A). As this Court has held, “[a]n inmate cannot demand release due [to] health risks associated with a virus while also refusing a vaccine that would eliminate that risk.” *United States v. Rivas*, 2021 WL 3603471, \*5 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 14, 2021). “A denial of vaccination is a denial of self-care, and refusing the vaccine that would mitigate risks of infections negates any extraordinary and compelling circumstances.” *Id.* Thus, Pierre fails to present evidence demonstrating a serious risk to his health.

Weighing the evidence, Pierre fails to prove that his incarceration is “extraordinary and compelling” under § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i) framework. *See United States v. Stowe*, No. CR H-11-803(2), 2019 WL 4673725, at \*2 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 25, 2019) (citation omitted) (stating that the defendant generally “has the burden to show circumstances meeting the test for compassionate release”).<sup>8</sup>

\* \* \*

Under the rule of finality, federal courts may not “modify a term of imprisonment once it has been imposed” unless one of a few “narrow exceptions” applies. *Freeman v. United States*, 564 U.S. 522, 526 (2011) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)) (plurality op.); *see also Dillon*, 560 U.S. at 819 (same). Compassionate release is one of those exceptions, but a defendant must conform both to the procedural and substantive requirements of § 3582(c)(1)(A) for a court to modify a sentence. Because Pierre has failed to meet the controlling requirements for compassionate release set forth

---

<sup>8</sup> Given Defendant’s failure to meet § 3582(c)(1)(A)’s requirements, the Court need not address whether the applicable 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors support a sentence reduction.

in § 3582(c)(1)(A)(i), his Motion must be denied.<sup>9</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSION

It is therefore **ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Compassionate Release (Dkt. #1214) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**SIGNED** this 29th day of September, 2021.

  
AMOS L. MAZZANT  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>9</sup> In the alternative, the Court is also unable to order home confinement. The BOP has exclusive authority to determine where a prisoner is housed; thus, the Court is without authority to order home confinement. 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b); *see also United States v. Miller*, No. 2:17-CR-015-D (02), 2020 WL 2514887, at \*1 (N.D. Tex. May 15, 2020) (“[N]either the CARES Act nor the First Step Act authorizes the court to release an inmate to home confinement.”).